

JUN 23 2011

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

TUANJA EDWARD ANDERSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

KATHLEEN DICKINSON,

Appellee,

BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 09-16345

D.C. No. 2:05-cv-01609-GEB

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Garland E. Burrell, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 15, 2011**

Before: CANBY, O'SCANNLAIN, and FISHER, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Tuanja Edward Anderson appeals from the district court's judgment denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition. We have

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2253, and we affirm.

Anderson contends that the evidence introduced at his trial was insufficient to support a conviction for second-degree murder. Based upon the evidence adduced at trial, a rational trier of fact could have found that the prosecution proved the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. *See Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 319 (1979). Accordingly, the state court's decision rejecting Anderson's claim was not contrary to, and did not involve an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, nor was it based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in state court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

AFFIRMED.